

Appl. No.: 09/280,421
Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003
Reply dated: June 24, 2004

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 31-34, 36-37, 41, 44-45, 48, 54, 58-62, 64-65, 69, 72-73, 76, 82, 86-90, 92-93, 97, 100-101, 104, 110, and 114 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoddie, U.S. Patent No. 5,727,141.

The Examiner suggests that Hoddie disclose a movie file shown in FIG. 2, which includes a video track 205, an audio track 210, and a container track 215. See column 6, lines 59-67. The Examiner further suggests that Hoddie permits the selection of objects in the image in order to retrieve additional information and a presentation mechanism. See column 1, lines 41-64; column 2, lines 22-42, and column 17, lines 29-31. The applicant would note that the container track includes data that describes "hot spots" that are superimposed on the image which are selectable by the user.

Claims 31, 59, and 87 patentably distinguishes over Hoddie by claiming a file containing both an image representative of a picture composed of a plurality of pixels and additional information associated with the image. Claims 31, 59, and 87 further patentably distinguishes over Hoddie by claiming a selection mechanism that permits the selection of graphical objects depicted by the picture by the pixels in the image for which the additional information is related thereto.

Appl. No.: 09/280,421
Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003
Reply dated: June 24, 2004

Hoddie does not describe a mechanism where the "hot spots" are defined as part of the image file itself, but are rather defined as a region superimposed on the image and accordingly is not part of the image itself stored in the file.

Claims 32-58 depend from claim 31, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 31.

Claims 60-86 depend from claim 59, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 59.

Claims 88-117 depend from claim 87, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 87.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 as being unpatentable over Klappert, U.S. Patent No. 6,256,785 in view of Throckmorton, U.S. Patent No., 5,818,441.

The Examiner suggests that Klappert teaches an X-Y protocol data used to provide linkage between primary video content and additional data. See, Abstract, column 8, lines 1-35. The X-Y protocol data defines an interactive hot-spot region of a frame.

Claims 1 and 21 patentably distinguishes over Hoddie in view of Throckmorton by claiming at least one of the frames representative of a picture composed of a plurality of pixels, and selectively providing additional information to a viewer approximately the time of said providing video where the additional information is an object depicted by the picture by the pixels.

Appl. No.: 09/280,421
Amdt. dated: December 23, 2003
Reply dated: June 24, 2004

Hoddie does not describe a mechanism where the "hot spots" are defined as part of the image file itself, but are rather defined as a region superimposed on the image and accordingly is not part of the image itself.

Claims 2-20 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Claims 22-30 depend from claim 21, either directly or indirectly, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 21.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider claims 1-117, and to pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP
1600 ODS Tower
601 SW Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

By: 

Kevin L. Russell
Reg. No. 38,292
Telephone No. (503) 227-5631
FAX No. (503) 228-4373